

ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

Applicants note, with appreciation, the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-29 based on the Schein et al patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,910). The new rejections are discussed below.

Before considering the new rejections, it is noted that, claims 19, 24 and 25 have been amended to include limitations similar to those of, for example, claim 1 and thus the rejection of claims 19, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being “clearly anticipated by” the newly cited Ohkura et al (Ohkura) reference is now moot and the rejection of claim 1 is relevant. Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being “unpatentable over” the Ohkura patent in view of the previously cited Kostreski patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Ohkura patent discloses a television reception controller which enables a viewer to choose a favorite program from among many broadcasting channels. The controller displays labels for categories (e.g. news, movies, etc.) on the top row of a display screen and displays pictures of broadcasting channels for a particular category on the screen in a column, as illustrated, e.g., in Figures 16 and 17 to which the Examiner has referred. These pictures are shown in “small frames” in the leftmost column of the screen and are displayed downwardly in the order of frequency of reception. Figure 12, to which the Examiner has also referred, depicts a “favorite program guide list” which includes rows of 30-minute time bands and columns of five categories corresponding to those mentioned above, in this case, news, movies, sports, politics and music. Each 30-minute time band has five entries of channel numbers in which are recorded five broadcasting channels of each category that have been received in the last four weeks in the order of the frequency of reception. An operation knob is used to rotate the category labels to the left for the display shown in Figure 16.

Figure 16 shows the category “movies” while Figure 17 shows the category “sports.”

The Examiner admits that “Ohkura does not clearly disclose one or more logical channels of the favorite channel lists related to user specified theme.” It is respectfully submitted that because the Kotreski patent does not disclose this feature either, no fair combination of the two references can result in the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 8, 19, 24 and 25.

Considering the Kostreski patent, this patent does provide, in Figure 5, for maps including a reserve section 522 that is the same for both the “StarSight” and “BVS” maps illustrated in this embodiment. However, it is not seen that this has anything to do with the present invention. Further, the Examiner contends that “Kotreski teaches each logical channel “SEL.” uniquely identifies a corresponding physical channel ‘VIP StarSight’ for a popular network such as CBS, ABC, NBC and FOX regardless the user select ‘VIP StarSight’ or ‘VIP BVS’.” It is noted that “SEL.” represents various selection keys and does not identify a channel as the Examiner appears to imply. Thus, as set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the Kotreski patent does not disclose the feature that the Examiner admits the Ohkura patent lacks.

Some of the independent claims discussed above set forth further features not disclosed by the references. In this regard, claim 8 recites channel map services to map a logical channel number in the favorite channel list to a physical channel number on a physical device available to the computerized system, as well as “favorites services providing user interfaces and management functions for each one of the favorite channel lists” and “electronic guide content services to determine what is programmed on the logical channel and to call up channel map services to determine the corresponding physical channel and physical device.” It is respectfully submitted that, there is no discussion in either of the references with respect to different physical devices or with respect to the use of channel map services in determining the corresponding physical channel and

physical device much less the use of electronic program guide services to call up the channel map services used to determine the corresponding physical channel and physical device.

With respect to independent claims 19 and 25, these claims provide that the step of identifying is achieved by matching one or more event themes from an electronic program guide content database to the user-specified theme. As pointed out by the Examiner, Ohkura provides for EPG information sent together with the video signals and audio signals from the broadcasting satellite to be fed to the demultiplexer 24 (see column 5, lines 10 to 20) and that the EPG information includes channel numbers, titles, broadcasting times and categories of programs that will be broadcast within the next several tens of hours from the present. However, it is not seen that the Ohkura patent discloses matching one or more event themes from such an electronic programming guide content database to a user-selected theme. As indicated above, Figure 12 of Ohkura shows a favorite program guide list and while this list is updated using the EPG, the list is not an EPG.

A number of the dependent claims set forth further features not disclosed in the references. Some of these have been discussed above in the discussions of claim 8 and claims 19 and 25. In addition, for example, claim 23 specifies that the step of identifying is achieved by matching one or more words in an event description from the EPG content database to the user-specified theme. Claim 29 is similar. In rejecting these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner refers to Figures 16 and 17 and to column 10, lines 15 to 27 "in which the system will match the desired user theme/category with one or more words in an event description, i.e., C1...C5 from the EPG content Database of Figure 12." It is respectfully submitted that this contention is not well taken. First, as indicated above, it is respectfully submitted that Figure 12 does not show an EPG content database. Further, there is simply no matching of one or more words in an

event description from the EPG content database. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 22 and 29 are separately patentable.

With respect to claims 20 and 21, the Examiner acknowledges that Ohkura “does not clearly disclose an EPG content database include ‘event sub-theme’ or generic ‘event sub-theme’ as claimed” but relies on Schein ‘394 as disclosing this features. As indicated above, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the contention that figure 12 discloses an EPG content database as that term is understood. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of the Ohkura and Schein ‘349 patent as proposed. In this regard, the mere inclusion in the theme/category table of figure 8 of the field “theme sub-category handle table” does not render obvious the features claimed in claims 20 and 21.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS